



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

RE

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/162,685 09/29/98 GLASER

H ST9-98-052

EXAMINER

TM02/0322

VICTOR G COOPER
GATES & COOPER
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES CA 90045

BASHORE, W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2176
DATE MAILED:

03/22/01

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

NG

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/162,685

Applicant(s)
Glaser et al.

Examiner
William L. Bashore

Group Art Unit
2176



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 27, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 12/27/2000 to the original application filed on 9/29/1998.
2. The objection to the title has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The objection to the Disclosure has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The rejection of claim 7 under 37 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph (lack of antecedent basis) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
5. The rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
6. The rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 11-12, 14-15, 17-19, 22-23, 25-26, 28-30, 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley and Arora has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
7. The rejection of claims 2, 5, 13, 16, 24, 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Mutschler has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
8. The rejection of claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Lisle has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
9. Claims 1-34 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34 are independent claims.

Drawings

10. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Art Unit: 2176

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. **Claims 1-8, 11-19, 22-30, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley et al. (hereinafter Foley), U.S. Patent No. 5,706,502 issued January 1998, in view of Arora et al. (hereinafter Arora), U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145 issued June 1999, and further in view of Francis et al. (Hereinafter Francis), U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092 issued January 2001.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 1 "*reading information from a project file...*"),

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table" (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 1 "*...the*

Art Unit: 2176

information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page”, and “from the form”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis’s taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 1 “*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*”).

- Foley does not specifically teach the display of mapped elements to an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 1 “*displaying the mapping*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of visibly showing files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 2,

Foley does not specifically teach the use of a form in generating information from said form to an HTML page. However, Francis teaches an HTML page embedded at some point with form objects, and information is generated using a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply

Art Unit: 2176

Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of the analysis of embedded forms in order to clearly identify relationships withing the portfolio of Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Foley teaches:

- a visual element control (Foley column 6 lines 31-33; compare with claim 3 "*a visual control*", and "*...group comprising a button*").

- Foley does not specifically teach selection from a picklist, and a data entry box. However, Arora teaches a picklist and a data entry box (Arora Figure 43; compare with claim 3 "*...a picklist, and a data entry box*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of alternate forms of input that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Foley teaches:

- an element name (Applet2), and an HTML file name (Applet2.htm) (Foley column 10 lines 35-45; compare with claim 4).

In regard to dependent claim 5,

Foley teaches an element name (Applet2), and an HTML file name (Applet2.htm) (Foley column 10 lines 35-45). Foley does not specifically teach a form name. However, Francis teaches an HTML element with the name "FORM" (Francis column 10 lines 50-55; compare with claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of form names in order to clearly identify elements within the portfolio of Foley.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 6,

- Foley does not specifically teach an element name and an HTML name in a row of a table.

However, Arora teaches a table comprising rows of names of elements, all of which belong to a products page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of showing data in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 7,

- Foley does not specifically teach row and column cells for entry of a mapping. However, Arora teaches row and column cells for entry of a mapping (Arora Figure 39; compare with claim 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of showing space in a visually organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 8,

- claim 8 is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Foley teaches:

- the managing and editing of portfolios comprising different projects (Foley Abstract, at top, column 11 lines 21-26; compare with claim 11).

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to independent claim 12, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 12 “*means for reading information from a project file...*”).

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 12 “...*the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page , and “from the form”*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis’s taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 12 “*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*”).

- Foley does not specifically teach the display of mapped elements to an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 12 “*displaying the mapping*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of

Art Unit: 2176

visibly showing files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to claims 13-19, 22,

- claims 13-19, 22 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2-8, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 23, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 23 "*reading information from a project file...*").

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a "Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table" (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 23 "*...the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page , and "from the form"*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and

Art Unit: 2176

forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 23 “*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*”).

- Foley does not specifically teach the display of mapped elements to an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 23 “*displaying the mapping*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of visibly showing files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to claims 24-30, 33,

- claims 24-30, 33 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2-8, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 34, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag, and said elements of said portfolio can be saved, edited, processed and restored (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 5 lines 32-49, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 34: “*a computer readable data*”).

Art Unit: 2176

structure....the data structure comprising:”, and “a first section comprising the executable programming logic needed to load and execute the project application in the computer”).

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 34 “... storing information *comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis’s taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- Foley does not specifically teach the display of said mapped elements and HTML file shown within a project. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 34 “*a second section for storing data required to restore the project environment*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of visibly showing files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

Art Unit: 2176

14. **Claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Francis as applied to claims 1, 12, 23 above, and further in view of Lisle et al. (hereinafter Lisle), U.S. Patent No. 6,069,630 issued May 2000.**

In regard to dependent claim 9,

- Foley does not specifically teach flagging an invalid mapping. However, Lisle teaches the indication of a link depending upon whether a link (element) is good or bad (Lisle Figure 4 item 410; compare with claim 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Lisle to Foley, because of the taught advantage up to date linking that Lisle provides to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 10,

- claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 20-21,

- claims 20-21 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 31-32,

- claims 31-32 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

15. **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Weinberg et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962	issued	November	2000
Ferrel et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,199,082	issued	March	2001

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1, 12, 23, 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. HTML pages and forms, form elements, and their relationships are now taught by newly found reference Francis to teach the claim limitations, as currently amended.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to this art unit is (703) 308-6606.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

19. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

William L. Bashore
3/15/2001


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100